## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application.

The following Groups of claims have been distinguished, as follows, by the Examiner:

Group I:

Claims 1-8, 10-15, and 20, drawn to an inorganic radiation protective

mixture and polymers containing them, classified in class 252,

subclass 478; and

Group II:

Claims 9 and 16-19, drawn to a process of making inorganic

radiation protective mixture and a process for preparing a polymeric

radiation protective substance, classified in class 252, subclass

183.11.

Applicants hereby elect Group I with traverse for the reasons stated below. In addition, as required by the Office Action for the purposes of examination, the Applicants also elect the compound defined by the following:

Component a)

Gadolinium in the form of Gd<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>;

Component b)

Tungsten; and

Component c)

Cerium in the form of CeO<sub>2</sub>.

The election of the species defined above with respect to components a) and b) reads on claims 1-20 and the election of component c) reads on claims 2 and 8.

As stated, the Applicants traverse the Restriction Requirement. It is respectfully submitted that the all of the claims of the instant application can be examined together without place an undue burden on the patent office. Group I claims are directed to inorganic protective mixtures and the Group II claims are directed to processes of making such. Therefore, it is believed that a thorough search of the claims of Group I would most certainly require a search of processes of making such compounds, which would encompass the subject matter of the Group II claims.

Furthermore, at the very least, in the event that product claims of Group I are found allowable, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of Group II (claims 9, and 16-

PO-7966

19) be rejoined in the instant application as they are directed to a process for the preparation of the compounds of claim 1. See MPEP §821.04(b). Moreover, all of the claims of Group II, either directly or indirectly depend from claim 1 of Group I and require all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, in the event that claim 1 is found allowable, the claims of Group II should be rejoined and fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.104. See MPEP §821.04(a).

Reconsideration of the restriction requirement in view of the forgoing is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Miller

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 50,732

LANXESS Corporation
Law & Intellectual Property Department
111 RIDC Park West Drive
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15275-1112
(412) 809-2232
FACSIMILE PHONE NUMBER:
(412) 809-1054

\sr\S:\Law Shared\SHARED\MAM\PATENTS\7966\Response restriction requirement 1-29-07.doc